

# ON CONDITIONAL UNIQUENESS OF SOLUTIONS TO STOCHASTIC NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS

ISTVÁN GYÖNGY AND NICOLAI V. KRYLOV

ABSTRACT. This paper is a continuation of [26]. Here theorems on conditional uniqueness and regularity for solutions to stochastic Navier-Stokes equations in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are presented.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Navier-Stokes equations,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u = \nu \Delta u - u_{(u)} - \nabla p + D_j f_j + f, \quad \operatorname{div} u = 0 \quad (1.1)$$

for  $t \geq 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with initial condition

$$u_t|_{t=0} = u_0 \quad (1.2)$$

for the evolution of the velocity and pressure fields  $u = (u_t^1(x), \dots, u_t^d(x))$  and  $p = p_t(x)$ , are among the most important equations in fluid dynamics and are also among the most studied PDEs in the literature. Here  $\nu$  is a positive constant,  $u_{(u)} = u^j D_j u$ ,

$$D_j f_j = \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} f_j^1, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} f_j^d \right), \quad f = (f^1, \dots, f^d)$$

are given force fields for  $t \geq 0$  and  $x = (x^1, \dots, x^d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $u_0 = (u_0^1, \dots, u_0^d)$  is a given velocity field on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\operatorname{div} f_j = \operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ .

By the classical results of Hopf [27] and Leray [37] for any  $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}$  at least one weak solution to (1.1)-(1.2) exists in the *Hopf-Leray class*,

$$\mathcal{W} := L_\infty([0, \infty), \mathcal{H}) \cap L_2([0, \infty), \mathcal{V}),$$

where

$$\mathcal{V} := \{u \in W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) : \operatorname{div} u = 0\}$$

and  $\mathcal{H}$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{V}$  in  $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ . (See, e.g., [35], [36], [38], [50], [21] and [48] for presentations of Leray and Hopf results and for further developments.)

Due to a famous theorem of Ladyzhenskaya, the uniqueness of the weak solution in this class is known when  $d = 2$ , and it is an open problem for  $d \geq 3$ . There is, however a considerable literature on *conditional uniqueness*

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q30, 35R60, 60H15.

*Key words and phrases.* Navier-Stokes equations, stochastic Navier-Stokes equations, weak solutions, conditional uniqueness and regularity, Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin condition.

of the solution under various criteria. The most well-known criterium is the Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin condition, which requires that for a  $T > 0$  the Hopf-Leray weak solution be in the space  $L_{p,q} = L_{p,q}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that

$$\frac{d}{p} + \frac{2}{q} \leq 1 \quad \text{for some } p \in (d, \infty] \text{ and } q \in [2, \infty), \quad (1.3)$$

where  $L_{p,q}$  denotes the space of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued functions  $v$  on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$|v|_{L_{p,q}}^q := \int_0^T |v_t|_{L_p}^q dt < \infty.$$

Under this condition the uniqueness of the Hopf-Leray weak solution on  $[0, T]$  was proved by Prodi [47] and Serrin [49], and smoothness of the solution was obtained by Ladyzhenskaya [46].

Our aim in the present paper is to generalise the conditional uniqueness result of Prodi and Serrin and to extend it stochastic Navier-Stokes equations and to prove also a theorem on conditional regularity of their solutions. Our condition is much weaker than the Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin condition (see Corollary 2.3).

We will consider the following type of stochastic Navier-Stokes equations,

$$\begin{aligned} du &= (\nu \Delta u - u_{(u)} + \nabla p + D_j f_j + f) dt \\ &\quad + (\sigma \nabla u - \nabla q + h) \circ dw, \quad \operatorname{div} u = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

$$u_t|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad (1.5)$$

for the random velocity field  $u = (u_t^1(x), \dots, u_t^d(x))$ , and pressure fields  $p = p_t(x)$  and  $q = q_t(x)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $w$  is a Hilbert space-valued Wiener process, and  $\circ dw_t$  indicates that the corresponding differential is understood in the Stratonovich sense. As it was shown in [41] and [42], equation (1.4) arises when one follows the classical scheme of Newtonian fluid dynamics, assuming that instead of a deterministic dynamics, the fluid particles satisfy the stochastic equation

$$d\eta_t(x) = u_t(\eta_t(x)) dt + \sigma_t(\eta_t(x)) \circ dw_t, \quad \eta_0(x) = x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

In [44] the authors study the Cauchy problem (1.4)-(1.5) with a second order elliptic differential operator instead of  $\Delta$ , and with force fields  $D_j f_j$ ,  $f$  and  $h$ , which may depend also on  $u$ . They show the existence of a solution on some filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, P)$  carrying an  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -Wiener process  $w$  with values in a Hilbert space. Moreover, in  $d = 2$  they show the existence and uniqueness of a unique strong solution. The solution  $u = (u_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  in [44] is understood as an  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued weakly continuous  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process such that  $u \in L_2([0, T], \mathcal{V})$  (a.s.), and almost surely satisfies the equations in a weak sense, similarly to the definition of a Hopf-Leray weak solution to (1.1)-(1.2).

We consider for  $d \geq 3$  the type of stochastic Navier-Stokes equations as in [44]. Adapting the notion of admissible random functions from [28] and [26],

we introduce the class of admissible solutions to them, see Definitions 2.1 and 2.2. Roughly speaking an admissible function  $u$  is function of  $(\omega, t, x)$ , such that it can be decomposed as a sum of two functions, say  $u^M$  and  $u^B$ , such that  $u^M$ , as a function of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , belongs to the Morrey space  $E_{r,1}$  for an  $r \in (2, d]$  and its Morrey norm is bounded by a constant, uniformly in  $(t, \omega)$ . The other component,  $u^B$  belongs to  $L_2([0, T], L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d))$  (a.s.).

First we show that an admissible solution has a modification which is a (strongly) continuous  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued function in  $t \in [0, T]$  for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ . This is Theorem 2.1 below. Then we present a theorem, Theorem 2.2 on conditional uniqueness, which in the special case of equation (1.4) reads as follows.

*There is a positive constant  $N$  depending only  $d, r$ , such that if  $u$  is an admissible solution with Morrey norm bounded by  $\nu/N$ , then every admissible solution coincides with  $u$ .*

Hence, see Corollary 2.3, we get that if  $u$  is a solution such that  $u \in L_{p,q}$  almost surely for a  $(p, q)$  satisfying the Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin condition (1.3), then the uniqueness holds in the class of admissible solutions. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.2, since it turns out that if  $u$  is a function from  $L_{p,q}$  (a.s.) such the condition (1.3) holds then  $u$  is admissible and admits a Morrey component with Morrey norm bounded by a positive constant as small as we wish. It is worth noting that the admissible functions form an essentially larger space than  $L_{p,q}$  with (1.3). Thus Theorem 2.2 generalises the result of Prodi and Serrin in the special case of deterministic Navier-Stokes equations, i.e., when  $\sigma = 0$ ,  $q = 0$  and  $h = 0$ , and extends that also to the type of stochastic Navier-Stokes equations (1.4)-(1.5). Under the conditions of Theorem 2.2 we present also a result, Theorem 5.1, on conditional regularity of the solution, when  $u_0 \in \mathcal{V}$  (a.s.),  $\mathbf{f} = 0$ , and  $\sigma$  and  $h$  satisfy appropriate differentiability conditions. We will prove further results on conditional regularity in the continuation of the present paper.

Stochastic Navier-Stokes equations are also extensively studied in the literature. We mention here only a few publications concerning their theory, starting with the pioneering paper [7], followed by [2], [11], [25] [10], [12], [6], [14] and others on solvability of the equations in various set-ups and approaches. Uniqueness results in  $d = 2$  can be found, e.g., in [3], [40] [4], [24], [44], [43]. Existence of local  $L_p$ -solutions to Navier-Stokes equations with Lévy noise is studied in [45]. The existence and uniqueness of solutions in an  $L_p$  setting for 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes with jump noise is investigated in [52], the local well-posedness in  $L_p$ -setting for 3D Navier-Stokes equations with multiplicative cylindrical noise in the whole space is studied in [30],

Existence and uniqueness of a global mild solution to random vorticity equations associated to stochastic Navier-Stokes equations in  $d = 3$  for small initial vorticity is obtained in [5]. Theorems on ergodicity in  $d = 2$  are presented in [19], [18], [33], [34], [9], [39], and a result on ergodicity in  $d=3$

is obtained [16]. Balance relations for randomly forced Navier-Stokes equations on the 2-dimensional torus are proved in [32]. In [1] well-posedness, regularisation results for the solutions and blow-up criteria are established, and a global well-posedness result with high probability for small initial data, in critical spaces is proved for stochastic Navier–Stokes equations on the  $d$ -dimensional torus for any  $d \geq 2$ .

For a comprehensive treatise on stochastic fluid dynamics we refer to [22].

We conclude with notations used in the paper. Let  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  be the space of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued compactly supported smooth functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\mathcal{D}$  denote its subspace consisting of the divergence-free functions. For integers  $m \geq 0$  and  $p \geq 1$  we use the notation  $\mathbb{W}_p^m = W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  for the Sobolev space of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued functions  $v = (v^1, \dots, v^d)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , which together with their generalised derivatives up to order  $m$  are  $L_p$ -functions. We use also the notation  $\mathbb{L}_p$  for  $\mathbb{W}_p^0$ . Note that  $\mathbb{W}_2^m$  with the inner product

$$(u, v)_{\mathbb{W}_2^m} := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} (D^\alpha u, D^\alpha v), \quad u, v \in \mathbb{W}_2^m$$

is a separable Hilbert space, where for any integer  $k \geq 1$  for  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued functions  $v$  and  $w$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  we use the notation

$$(v, w) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v^i(x) w^i(x) dx$$

when the integral is well-defined. If  $B$  is a ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by  $|B|$  we mean its volume and set

$$\int_B f dx = \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f dx.$$

The derivatives of  $Dv$  of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ -valued functions in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we view as functions with values in the  $m \times d$  matrices,  $(D_i v^n) = (v^{ni})$ , and we treat the space of  $m \times d$  matrices as the  $md$ -dimensional Euclidean space as well. For functions  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , with values in a tensor space  $\mathbb{T}$ , the notation  $|f|_{L_2}$  is defined by

$$|f|_{L_2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)|_{\mathbb{T}}^2 dx,$$

where  $|f(x)|_{\mathbb{T}}$  denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the tensor  $f(x)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  be the divergence free subspaces of  $\mathbb{L}_2 := \mathbb{W}_2^0$  and  $\mathbb{W}_2^1$ , respectively, i.e.,  $\mathcal{H}$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{D}$  in  $\mathbb{L}_2$ , and

$$\mathcal{V} := \{u \in \mathbb{W}_2^1 : \operatorname{div} u = 0\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the orthogonal projection of  $\mathbb{L}_2$  onto  $\mathcal{H}$ , and define the operator  $\mathcal{R} = I - \mathcal{S}$ , where  $I$  is the identity operator.

For functions  $\varphi$  and vector fields  $u = (u^1, \dots, u^d)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  we use the notations

$$D_i \varphi = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \varphi, \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, d), \quad \nabla \varphi = D\varphi = (D_1 \varphi, \dots, D_d \varphi),$$

$$\varphi_{(u)} = u^j D_j \varphi,$$

$Du$  for the Jacobian matrix  $(Du)^{ij} = D_j u^i$ , and  $D^2u$  for the tensor  $(D^2u)^{ijl} = D_i D_j u^l$ ,  $i, j, l = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . Unless otherwise stated, through the paper we use the summation convention with respect to repeated integer-valued indices. Thus  $u_{(u)}$  denotes the  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued function

$$(u^j D_j u^1, u^j D_j u^2, \dots, u^j D_j u^d)$$

on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For normed spaces  $B$  we use the notation  $\ell_2(B)$  for the space of sequences  $c = (c_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of elements  $c_n \in B$ , with the norm  $|c|_{\ell_2(B)} = (\sum_n |c_n|_B^2)^{1/2}$ . We write  $\ell_2$  instead of  $\ell_2(\mathbb{R})$ .

All random elements in this paper are defined on a fixed filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, P)$  carrying a sequence of independent  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -Wiener processes  $(w^k)_{k=1}^\infty$ . We assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $P$ -complete and that  $\mathcal{F}_0$  contains all the  $P$ -zero sets of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We use the notation  $\mathcal{P}$  for the predictable  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega \times [0, \infty)$ . For a topological space  $S$  the notation  $\mathcal{B}(S)$  means the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $S$ .

## 2. FORMULATION OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

Consider the equations

$$\begin{aligned} du_t = & (D_i (a_t^{ij} D_j u_t + f_t^i(u_t)) + f_t(u_t, Du_t) - u_{t(u_t)} - \nabla p_t + \gamma_t^{ki} D_i q_t^k) dt \\ & + (\sigma_t^{ik} D_i u_t + h_t^k(u_t) - \nabla q_t^k) dw_t^k, \quad \operatorname{div} u_t = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , with initial condition

$$u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2.2)$$

for a velocity field  $u = (u_t^1(t, x), \dots, u_t^d(t, x))$  and pressure fields  $p = p_t(x)$  and  $q = (q_t^k(x))_{k=1}^\infty$  on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ .

We assume that

(i) the coefficient  $a = (a^{kl})$  is  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ -valued,  $\gamma^i = (\gamma^{ik})_{k=1}^\infty$  is an  $\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued and  $\sigma^i = (\sigma^{ik})_{k=1}^\infty$  is an  $\ell_2$ -valued  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  measurable function on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ ;

(ii) the functions  $f^i$  and  $f$  are  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued,  $f^i$  is a  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable mapping on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $f$  is a  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ -measurable mapping on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . The function  $h = (h^k)_{k=1}^\infty$  is an  $\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable mapping on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Definition 2.1.** A  $\mathcal{V}$ -valued predictable process  $u = (u_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a solution to (2.1)-(2.2) if  $u \in L_2([0, T], \mathcal{V}) \cap L_\infty([0, T], \mathcal{H})$  (a.s.), and for each  $v \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathbb{L}_d$

$$\begin{aligned}
(u_t, v) &= (u_0, v) - \int_0^t [(a_s^{ij} D_j u_s + \mathfrak{f}_s^i(u_s), D_i v) + (u_{s(u_s)}, v)] ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t (\gamma_s^{ki} D_i q_s^k + f_s(u_s, Du_s), v) ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t (\sigma_s^{jk} D_j u_s + h_s^k(u_s), v) dw_s^k, \tag{2.3}
\end{aligned}$$

holds for  $P \otimes dt$ -almost every  $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ , where

$$\nabla q_t^k = \mathcal{R}(\sigma_t^{jk} D_j u_t + h_t^k(u_t)) \quad P \otimes dt \otimes dx\text{-a.e.} \quad \text{for every } k \geq 1. \tag{2.4}$$

We call  $(u_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  an  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution if it is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted continuous process such that  $u \in L_2([0, T], \mathcal{V})$  (a.s.), and almost surely (2.3) holds for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathbb{L}_d$ , and (2.4) is satisfied.

*Remark 2.1.* We note that if Assumption 2.1 and (2.10) below hold for  $h$ , then equation (2.4) ensures that for any solution  $u$

$$M_t^k(u_t) - \nabla q_t^k = \mathcal{S}M_t^k(u_t) \in \mathcal{H} \quad (P \otimes dt \otimes dx\text{-a.e.}), \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where

$$M_t^k(u) := \sigma_t^{ik} D_i u + g_t^k(u) \quad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{V}. \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, by equation (2.4) we have

$$\gamma^{ki} D_i q^k = \gamma^{ki} (\mathcal{R}M^k(u))^i \quad \text{for each } k \geq 1, \tag{2.6}$$

where  $(\mathcal{R}M^k(u))^i$  is the  $i$ -th coordinate of  $\mathcal{R}M^k(u)$ , which closes the equation (2.3) for  $u$ .

*Remark 2.2.* If  $q > 1$  such that  $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{d}$ , then  $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{d} = 1$  and thus by Hölder's inequality and by the Sobolev inequality  $|w|_{L_q} \leq N(d)|w|_{W_2^1}$  we have

$$|(v_{(u)}, w)| \leq |u|_{L_q} |Dv|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |w|_{\mathbb{L}_d} \leq N(d)|u|_{\mathbb{W}_2^1} |Dv|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |w|_{\mathbb{L}_d} < \infty$$

for any  $u, v, w \in \mathbb{W}_2^1$ . Hence for  $(u_{s(u_s)}, v)$  in (2.3) we have

$$\int_0^T |(u_{s(u_s)}, v)| ds \leq N(d)|v|_{\mathbb{L}_d} \int_0^T |u_s|_{\mathbb{W}_2^1}^2 ds < \infty \text{ (a.s.) for any } v \in \mathbb{L}_d.$$

This is why test functions  $v$  from  $\mathcal{V} \cap L_d$  are used.

We make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 2.1.** (i) There is a constant  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$|a| \leq \delta^{-1}, \quad (a^{ij} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{ik}\sigma^{jk})\lambda^i\lambda^j \geq \delta|\lambda|^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d, \omega, t, x. \tag{2.7}$$

(ii) There is a nonnegative predictable process  $\vartheta_t$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ , such that

$$\int_0^T \vartheta_t^2 dt < \infty$$

and

$$|\gamma_t(x)|^2 := \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\gamma_t^{ki}(x)|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 \leq \vartheta_t^2 \quad \text{for all } \omega, t, x. \quad (2.8)$$

*Remark 2.3.* Note that by Assumption 2.1 (i) we have

$$|\sigma_t|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\sigma^{ik}|^2 \leq N^2$$

for a nonnegative constant  $N = N(d, \delta)$ .

**Assumption 2.2.** There exist nonnegative predictable processes  $\lambda$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\chi$ , and nonnegative  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable functions  $\mathfrak{F}$  and  $\mathfrak{G}$  on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\int_0^T (\lambda_t^2 + \chi_t^2 + \kappa_t) dt < \infty, \quad \int_0^T (|\mathfrak{F}_t|_{L_2}^2 + |\mathfrak{G}_t|_{L_2}) dt < \infty \quad (a.s.), \quad (2.9)$$

and

(i) for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $x, u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

$$|\mathfrak{f}_t(x, u)| + |\mathfrak{h}_t(x, u)| \leq \lambda_t |u| + \mathfrak{F}_t(x), \quad (2.10)$$

$$|f_t(x, u, z)| \leq \kappa_t |u| + \chi_t |z| + \mathfrak{G}_t(x),$$

(ii) for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $x, u_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ )

$$|\mathfrak{f}_t(x, u_1) - \mathfrak{f}_t(x, u_2)| + |\mathfrak{h}_t(x, u_1) - \mathfrak{h}_t(x, u_2)| \leq \lambda_t |u_1 - u_2|, \quad (2.11)$$

$$|f_t(x, u_1, z_1) - f_t(x, u_2, z_2)| \leq \kappa_t |u_1 - u_2| + \chi_t |z_1 - z_2|. \quad (2.12)$$

**Assumption 2.3.** The initial condition  $u_0$  is an  $\mathcal{F}_0$ -measurable random variable in  $\mathcal{H}$ .

We assume  $d \geq 3$ . To formulate our results we define the following class of functions for a fixed  $\rho_0 \in (0, 1]$ , where we use the notation  $\mathbb{B}_\rho$  for the set of balls in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with radius  $\rho$ .

**Definition 2.2.** A real-, vector-, or tensor-valued function  $f$  defined on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  is called admissible if  $f = f^M + f^B$  for some  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable functions  $f^M$  and  $f^B$ , such that for some  $r \in (2, d]$  with a constant  $\hat{f}$  and a nonnegative predictable function  $\bar{f}$  on  $\Omega \times [0, T]$  we have

$$\left( \int_{B_\rho} |f^M(t, x)|^r dx \right)^{1/r} \leq \hat{f} \rho^{-1} \quad \text{for } B_\rho \in \mathbb{B}_\rho \text{ and } \rho \leq \rho_0, \quad (2.13)$$

for all  $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ ,

$$\text{ess sup}_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f_t^B(x)| \leq \bar{f}_t \quad \text{for all } (t, \omega), \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\Omega} \int_0^T \bar{f}_t^2 dt < \infty. \quad (2.14)$$

Observe that  $f(x) = |x|^{-1}$  satisfies (2.13) with finite  $\hat{f}$  for any  $r \in [1, d)$  (and  $\rho_0 = \infty$ ).

For  $r \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$  we denote by  $E_{r,\lambda}$  the *Morrey space* of functions  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with values in a Euclidean space, such that

$$|f|_{r,\lambda} := \sup_{\rho \in (0, \rho_0], B \in \mathbb{B}_\rho} \rho^\lambda \left( \int_{B_\rho} |f(x)|^r dx \right)^{1/r} < \infty.$$

Then (2.13) means that  $|f^M|_{r,1} \leq \hat{f}$ .

We say that an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued function  $u$  is an admissible solution to (2.1)-(2.2) if it is an admissible function and  $(u_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a solution to (2.1)-(2.2) in the sense of Definition 2.1.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 (i) and 2.3 hold. Assume  $u$  is an admissible solution to (2.1)-(2.2). Then  $u$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution in the sense that it has a  $P \otimes dt$ -modification, denoted also by  $u$ , which is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} & E \sup_{t \leq T} |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + E \int_0^T \alpha_t |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt + E \int_0^T |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 dt \leq NE |u_0|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\ & + NE \int_0^T |e^{-\varphi_t} \mathfrak{F}_t|_{L_2}^2 dt + NE \int_0^T |e^{-\varphi_t} F_t|_{L_2}^2 dt + NE \left( \int_0^T |e^{-\varphi_t} \mathfrak{G}_t|_{L_2} dt \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where  $N = N(d, \delta)$  is a constant and

$$\varphi_t = \int_0^t \alpha_s ds, \quad \alpha_s = N'(\lambda_s^2 + \chi_s^2 + \theta_s^2 + \kappa_s) + \mu_s$$

with a constant  $N' = N'(\delta)$  and any predictable process  $\mu \geq 0$  such that

$$\int_0^T \mu_t dt < \infty \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \Omega.$$

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let Assumption 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 hold, and assume that  $u$  and  $v$  are admissible solutions to (2.1)-(2.2) on  $[0, T]$ . Then there exists a (finite) constant  $N = N(d, r) > 0$  such that if*

$$\min(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) < \delta/N, \quad (2.16)$$

then almost surely  $u(t) = v(t)$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 hold, and assume that  $u$  is a solution to (2.1)-(2.2) such that almost surely*

$$\int_0^T |u_s|_{L_p}^q ds < \infty$$

for some  $d < p \leq \infty$  and  $2 \leq q < \infty$  satisfying the Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin condition

$$\frac{d}{p} + \frac{2}{q} \leq 1. \quad (2.17)$$



Then  $u$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution, and if  $v$  is any admissible solution then for its  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued continuous modification, denoted also by  $v$ , we have that almost surely  $u_t = v_t$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof.* We show (following Remark 7.1 in [26]) that  $u$  is admissible, with  $\hat{u} \leq \varepsilon$  for as small  $\varepsilon > 0$  as we wish, which by virtue of condition (2.16) proves the corollary. Indeed, if  $p < \infty$  then let  $r = d$  and set

$$\zeta_t = c \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_t(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/(p-d)} \quad \text{with a constant } c,$$

and define  $u_t^M(x) = u_t(x) \mathbf{1}_{|u_t(x)| \geq \zeta_t}$ ,  $u_t^B = u_t - u_t^M = u_t \mathbf{1}_{|u_t| \leq \zeta_t}$ . Then for any  $B \in \mathbb{B}_\rho$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\int_B |u_t^M(x)|^d dx \leq \zeta_t^{d-p} \int_B |u_t(x)|^p dx \leq N(d) c^{d-p} \rho^{-d} \leq \varepsilon \rho^{-d}$$

for sufficiently large  $c = c(d, p, \varepsilon)$ , and clearly,  $|u_t^B| \leq \zeta_t$  such that

$$\int_0^T \zeta_t^2 dt = c^2 \int_0^T |u_t|_{L^p}^{2p/(p-q)} dt < \infty, \quad \text{since } 2p/(p-q) \leq q.$$

If  $p = \infty$  then we take  $u^M = 0$ ,  $u^B = u$ ,  $\hat{u} = 0$  and  $\bar{u}_t := |u_t|_{L^\infty}$ , and notice that

$$\int_0^T \bar{u}_t^2 dt = \int_0^T |u_t|_{L^\infty}^2 dt < \infty \quad (\text{a.s.}), \quad \text{since } q \geq 2,$$

which completes the proof of the corollary.  $\square$

*Remark 2.4.* If  $u \in L_{d,\infty}$  (a.s.) then by the above calculations  $u$  is still admissible for  $r = d$ , but to be able to apply the corollary we need further conditions ensuring that the Morrey norm of  $u^M$  is sufficiently small, uniformly in  $(\omega, t)$ . We remark that in the case  $d = 3$  results on uniqueness and smoothness for Hopf-Leray weak solutions to deterministic Navier-Stokes equations (1.1)-(1.2) (with  $\mathfrak{f} = 0$ ,  $f = 0$ ) are obtained in [20] when the solutions belong to  $L_{d,\infty}$ , and for any  $d \geq 3$  such results are proved in [17].

*Remark 2.5.* The case  $(d/p) + (2/q) < 1$  in (2.17) is often called the subcritical case and  $(d/p) + (2/q) = 1$  is called the critical case. In connection with this we note that there are admissible functions  $u$  such that  $r < d$  and  $u^M(t, \cdot) \notin L_{r+\varepsilon, \text{loc}}$  no matter how small  $\varepsilon > 0$  is. Thus Theorem 2.2 covers examples also in the ‘‘supercritical’’ case.

### 3. PRELIMINARIES

First we present a version of the Itô formula, Theorem 3.1 from [26]. To this end let  $(V, (\cdot, \cdot)_V)$  and  $(H, (\cdot, \cdot)_H)$  be some separable Hilbert spaces such that  $V$  continuously and densely embedded in  $H$ .

Assume we are given  $V$ -valued functions  $v, v^*$ , an  $H$ -valued function  $F$ , and an  $\ell_2(H)$ -valued function  $G = (G^k)$ , which are predictable functions on

$\Omega \times [0, \infty)$  such that

$$\int_0^T |v_t|_V^2 + |v_t^*|_V^2 + |G_t|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 dt + \int_0^T |F_t|_H dt < \infty \quad (a.s.) \quad (3.1)$$

for any  $T \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $v_0$  be an  $H$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_0$ -measurable random variable, and assumed that for every  $v \in V$  we have

$$(v, v_t)_H = (v, v_0)_H + \int_0^t [(v, v_s^*)_V + (v, F_s)_H] ds + \int_0^t (v, G_s^k)_H dw_s^k \quad (3.2)$$

almost surely for  $dt$ -almost all  $t \in (0, \infty)$ . Then the following theorem holds.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Under the above assumptions there exists a continuous  $H$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process  $(u_t)_{t \geq 0}$  such that*

- (i)  $u_t = v_t$  for  $P \otimes dt$ -almost everywhere;
- (ii) with probability one we have

$$(v, u_t)_H = (v, v_0)_H + \int_0^t [(v, v_s^*)_V + (v, f_s)_H] ds + \int_0^t (v, g_s^k)_H dw_s^k \quad (3.3)$$

for all  $v \in V$  and  $t \geq 0$ ;

- (iii) with probability one

$$\begin{aligned} |u_t|_H^2 = & |v_0|_H^2 + 2 \int_0^t [(u_s, v_s^*)_V + (u_s, F_s)_H + \frac{1}{2}|G_s|_{\ell_2(H)}^2] ds \\ & + 2 \int_0^t (u_s, G_s^k)_H dw_s^k \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $f$  is real-valued admissible function then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f_t|^2 |\varphi|^2 dx \leq N \hat{f}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |D\varphi|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (N \rho_0^{-2} \hat{f}^2 + 2 \bar{f}_t^2) |\varphi|^2 dx \quad (3.5)$$

for all  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty$  with a constant  $N = N(d, r)$ .

This lemma follows from Lemma 3.5 of [29].

Define

$$\mathfrak{b}(u, v, w) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^j(x) D_j v^i(x) w^i(x) dx \quad (3.6)$$

for  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued Borel functions  $u, v$  and  $w$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  when the generalised derivatives  $D_j v^i$  are functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and the integral is well-defined.

**Corollary 3.3.** (i) *Let  $u$  be a  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued admissible function and let  $v, w \in \mathbb{W}_2^1$ . Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, w) \leq & N \hat{u} (|Dv|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \rho_0^{-1} |v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) |Dw|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\ & + N \bar{u}_t |Dv|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |w|_{\mathbb{L}_2}, \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *Let  $w$  be a  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued admissible function and let  $v, u \in \mathbb{W}_2^1$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, w) \leq & N \hat{w} (|Dv|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \rho_0^{-1} |v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) |Du|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\ & + N \bar{w}_t |Dv|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |u|_{\mathbb{L}_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $N$  is a constant depending only on  $d$  and  $r$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to see that Lemma 3.2 holds also for all  $\varphi \in W_2^1$ . Hence using first the Cauchy-Schwarz-Bunyakovsky inequality for the integral of the product of functions  $u_t^j w^i$  and  $D_j v^i$  and then applying (3.5) to  $|u_t^j|^2 |w^i|^2$  for each  $i, j$ , we obtain this corollary. We get (3.3) in the same way.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $u$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued admissible function and let  $v, w \in \mathbb{W}_2^1$ . Then for all  $(\omega, t)$  we have  $|\mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, w)| < \infty$ . Moreover, if  $u_t \in \mathcal{V}$  then*

$$\mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, w) = -\mathfrak{b}(u_t, w, v).$$

*Proof.* Clearly,  $|\mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, w)| < \infty$  by Corollary 3.3. For  $\varepsilon > 0$  let  $\varphi_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $|v_t - \varphi_\varepsilon|_{\mathbb{W}_2^1} \leq \varepsilon$ . Then by integration by parts, by the Leibniz rule and using that  $\operatorname{div} u_t = 0$  we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_t^j D_j \varphi_\varepsilon^i w^i dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\varepsilon^i D_j (w^i u_t^j) dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_t^j D_j w^i \varphi_\varepsilon^i dx. \quad (3.7)$$

By Corollary 3.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{b}(u_t, v - \varphi_\varepsilon, w)| &\leq N \hat{u} (|Dv - D\varphi_\varepsilon|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \rho_0^{-1} |v - \varphi_\varepsilon|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) |Dw|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\ &\quad + N \bar{u}_t |Dv - D\varphi_\varepsilon|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |w|_{\mathbb{L}_2}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$\mathfrak{b}(u_t, \varphi_\varepsilon, w) \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, w) \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

In the same way we get  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{b}(u_t, w, \varphi_\varepsilon) = \mathfrak{b}(u_t, w, v)$ . Thus letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in (3.7) we finish the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $u$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued admissible function such that  $u_t \in \mathcal{V}$  for all  $(\omega, t)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, v) = 0$  for  $v \in \mathbb{W}_2^1$ ,  $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ .*

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $u$  and  $v$  be  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued admissible function such that  $u_t \in \mathcal{V}$ , and  $v, w \in \mathbb{W}_2^1$  for all  $(\omega, t)$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, w) &\leq N \hat{v} (|Dw|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \rho_0^{-1} |w|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) |Du|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\ &\quad + N \bar{v}_t |Dw|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \end{aligned}$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, r)$ .

*Proof.* We use that  $\mathfrak{b}(u_t, v, w) = -\mathfrak{b}(u_t, w, v)$  and apply Corollary 3.3.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREMS 2.1 AND 2.2

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Let  $u$  be an admissible solution on  $[0, T]$ . We set  $H = \mathcal{H}$ ,  $V = \mathcal{V}$ , denote the conjugate of  $V$  by  $V^*$  and the duality between  $v \in V$  and  $v^* \in V^*$  by  $\langle v, v^* \rangle$ . Note that  $v^* \in V^*$  can be identified with  $Qv^* \in V$  such that  $\langle v, v^* \rangle = (v, Qv^*)_V$  holds for every  $v \in V$ , and thus  $|v^*|_{V^*} = |Qv|_V$ .

We will apply Theorem 3.1 to prove Theorem 2.1. By definition of the solution,

$$\int_0^T |u(t)|_V^2 dt < \infty \quad (a.s.). \quad (4.1)$$

We are going to define  $v_t^* \in V^*$ ,  $F_t \in H$  and  $G_t = (G_t^k) \in \ell_2(H)$  by requiring

$$\langle v, v_t^* \rangle = -(a_t^{ij} D_j u_t + f_t^i(u_t), D_i v) - (u^{Mj} D_j u_t, v), \quad (4.2)$$

$$(v, F_t)_H = (-u_t^{Bj} D_j u + f_t(u, Du) + \gamma_t^{kj} D_j q_t^k, v) \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$(v, G_t^k)_H = (\sigma_t^{jk} D_j u_t + h_t^k(u), v) \quad \text{for } k \geq 1, \quad (4.4)$$

respectively for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . By Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 (i) and Corollary 3.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(a_t^{ij} D_j u_t + f_t^i(u_t), D_i v)| &\leq (\delta^{-1} |Du|_{L_2} + \lambda_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + |\mathfrak{F}_t|_{L_2}) |v|_V, \\ |(u^{Mj} D_j u_t, v)| &\leq N \hat{u} (|Du|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \rho_0^{-1} |u|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) |v|_V. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can see, noticing that

$$\int_0^T \lambda_t^2 |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 dt \leq \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \int_0^T \lambda_t^2 dt < \infty, \quad (4.5)$$

that there is a predictable  $V^*$ -valued process  $v^*$ , identified with the  $V$ -valued process  $Qv^*$  such that

$$\int_0^T |v_t^*|_{V^*}^2 dt = \int_0^T |Qv_t^*|_V^2 dt < \infty \quad (a.s.) \quad (4.6)$$

and (4.2) holds. Using the definition of admissible functions and Assumption (2.1) (i) we have

$$|-u_t^{Bj} D_j u_t + f_t(u_t, Du)|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \leq \bar{u}_t |Du_t|_{L_2} + \kappa_t |u_t|_{L_2} + \chi_t |Du_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + |\mathfrak{G}_t|_{L_2},$$

where

$$\int_0^T \kappa_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} dt \leq \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \int_0^T \kappa_t dt < \infty \quad (a.s.), \quad (4.7)$$

and by the Cauchy-Bunyakovsky-Schwarz inequality

$$\int_0^T (\bar{u}_t |Du_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \chi_t |Du_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) dt < \infty.$$

Using (2.6), Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (i)

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma_t^{ki} D_i q_t^k|_{\mathbb{L}_2} &= |\gamma_t^{ki} (\mathcal{R}M_t^k(u_t))^i|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \leq \vartheta_t \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\mathcal{R}M_t^k(u_t)|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \vartheta_t \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |M_t^k(u_t)|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq N (\vartheta_t |Du_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \vartheta_t \lambda_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \vartheta_t |\mathfrak{F}_t|_{L_2}) \end{aligned}$$

with a constant  $N = N(K, d)$ . Notice that

$$\int_0^T \vartheta_t \lambda_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} dt \leq \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \int_0^T (\vartheta_t^2 + \lambda_t^2) dt < \infty \quad (a.s.). \quad (4.8)$$

Hence  $F_t := \mathcal{S}(-u_t^{Bj} D_j u_t + f_t(u_t, Du) + \gamma_t^{ki} D_i q_t^k)$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ , is an  $H$ -valued predictable process such that (4.3) holds and

$$\int_0^T |F_t|_H dt \leq \int_0^T |-u_t^{Bj} (D_j u_t + f_t(u_t, Du) + \gamma_t^{ki} D_i q_t^k)|_{\mathbb{L}_2} dt < \infty \text{ (a.s.)}. \quad (4.9)$$

Notice that by Assumptions 2.1 (i), 2.2 (i) and Remark 2.3 we have

$$\sum_k |\sigma^{ik} D_i u_t + h_t^k(u_t)|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \leq N(|Du_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + \lambda_t^2 |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2)$$

with  $N = N(\delta, d)$ , and by the definition of a solution and by (4.6)

$$\int_0^T |Du_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + \lambda_t^2 |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \leq \int_0^T |Du_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 dt + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, T]} |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \int_0^T \lambda_t^2 dt < \infty \text{ (a.s.)}.$$

Hence, because the operator norm of  $\mathcal{S}$  is 1,

$$G_t = (G_t^k)_{k=1}^\infty := (\mathcal{S}(\sigma^{ik} D_i u_t + h_t^k(u_t)))_{k=1}^\infty, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

is an  $\ell_2(H)$ -valued predictable process such that

$$\int_0^T |G_t|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 dt < \infty \text{ (a.s.)}, \quad (4.10)$$

and (4.4) holds. For  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  the convolution  $v^{(\varepsilon)} = v * k_\varepsilon$  belongs to  $\mathcal{V} \cap L_d$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |v - v^{(\varepsilon)}|_{\mathcal{V}} = 0$ , when  $k_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-d} k(\cdot/\varepsilon)$ . and  $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$  has compact support and unit integral. This shows that  $\mathcal{V} \cap L_d$  is dense in  $\mathcal{V}$ . Hence, due to (4.2), (4.3), (4.4), (4.6), (4.9) and the definition of the solution, we have (3.1) and (3.2). Thus we can apply Theorem 3.1 to get that a  $P \otimes dt$ -modification of  $u$ , denoted also by  $u$ , is an  $H$ -valued continuous process and almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} |u_t|_H^2 &= |u_0|_H^2 - 2 \int_0^t [(a_s^{ij} D_i u_s + \mathfrak{f}_s(u_s), D_j u_s) + (u_s(u_s), u_s)] ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t (f_s(u_s, Du_s) + \gamma_s^{kj} D_j u_s, u_s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \sum_k |\mathcal{S}(\sigma_s^{ik} D_i u_s + h_s(u_s))|_H^2 ds + m_t \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

holds for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , where

$$m_t = 2 \int_0^t (\sigma^{ik} D_i u_s + h_s^k(u_s), u_s) dw_s^k.$$

To show the estimate (2.15) we may assume that the expression on right-hand side of (2.15) is finite. First note that by Corollary 3.5 we have

$$(u_{t(u_t)}, u_t) = 0 \quad (P \otimes dt\text{-a.e.}) \quad (4.12)$$

Then use that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (i) to get

$$I_s := -2(a_s^{ij} D_i u_s - 2\mathfrak{f}_s(u_s), D_j u_s) - 2(f_s(u_s, Du_s) + 2\gamma_s^{kj} D_j u_s, u_s)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq -2(a_s^{ij} D_i u_s, D_j u_s) + 2\lambda_s |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |Du_s|_{L_2} + 2|\mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2} |Du_s|_{L_2} \\
&\quad + 2\kappa_s |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + 2\chi_s |Du_s|_{L_2} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\
&\quad + 2|\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + 2\vartheta_s |Du_s|_{L_2} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\
&\leq -2(a_s^{ij} D_i u_s, D_j u_s) + \frac{\delta}{2} |Du_s|_{L_2}^2 + N(\lambda_s^2 + \chi_s^2 + \vartheta_s^2 + \kappa_s) |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \\
&\quad + |\mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 + 2|\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}, \tag{4.13}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_s &:= \sum_k |\mathcal{S}(\sigma_s^{ik} D_i u_s + h_s^k(u_s))|_H^2 \leq \sum_k |\sigma_s^{ik} D_i u_s + h_s^k(u_s)|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \\
&\leq (\sigma_s^{ik} \sigma_s^{ik} D_i u_s, D_j u_s) + 2|(\sigma_s^{ik} D_i u_s, h_s^k(u_s))| + \sum_k |h_s^k(u_s)|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \\
&\leq (\sigma_s^{ik} \sigma_s^{ik} D_i u_s, D_j u_s) + \frac{\delta}{2} |Du_s|_{L_2}^2 + N\lambda_s^2 |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + N|\mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 \tag{4.14}
\end{aligned}$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, \delta)$ . Note that by Assumption 2.1 we have

$$((2a_s^{ij} - \sigma^{ik} \sigma^{jk}) D_i u_s, D_j u_s) \geq 2\delta |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2.$$

Thus, by (4.13) and (4.14) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_s + J_s &\leq -\delta |Du_s|_{L_2}^2 + N(\lambda_s^2 + \chi_s^2 + \vartheta_s^2 + \kappa_s) |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \\
&\quad + N|\mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 + 2|\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2},
\end{aligned}$$

Using this and (4.12), from (4.11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
d|u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 &\leq (-\delta |Du_t|_{L_2}^2 + N(\lambda_t^2 + \chi_t^2 + \vartheta_t^2 + \kappa_t) |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2) dt \\
&\quad (N|\mathfrak{F}_t|_{L_2}^2 + 2|\mathfrak{G}_t|_{L_2} |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) dt + dm_t \tag{4.15}
\end{aligned}$$

with a constant  $N = N(\delta)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
d|e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 &\leq (-\delta |e^{-\varphi_t} Du_t|_{L_2}^2 - \alpha_t |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2) dt \\
&\quad + (N|e^{-\varphi_t} \mathfrak{F}_t|_{L_2}^2 + 2e^{-2\varphi_t} |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |\mathfrak{G}_t|_{L_2}) dt + e^{-2\varphi_t} dm_t.
\end{aligned}$$

From this, by standard stopping time argument and the using Hölder's and Young's inequalities we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&E|e^{-\varphi_{T \wedge \tau}} u_{T \wedge \tau}|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + \delta E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} Du_s|_{L_2}^2 ds + E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} \alpha_s |e^{-\varphi_s} u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 ds \\
&\leq E|u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + NE \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds + 2E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-2\varphi_s} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \tag{4.16}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \leq E|u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds \\
&\quad + 2E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-2\varphi_s} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds + E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} \int_0^t e^{-2\varphi_s} dm_s \\
&\leq E|u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds + \frac{1}{4} E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$+4\left(E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-\varphi_s} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds\right)^2 + E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} \int_0^t e^{-2\varphi_s} dm_s \quad (4.17)$$

for any stopping time  $\tau \leq T$ . By the Davis inequality, Hölder's and Young's inequalities we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} \int_0^t e^{-2\varphi_s} dm_s &\leq 6E \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-4\varphi_s} J_s |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + NE \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-2\varphi} J_s ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

By (4.14) and using (4.16), for the last term here we get

$$\begin{aligned} &NE \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-2\varphi} J_s ds \\ &\leq N_1 \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} (|e^{-\varphi_s} Du_s|_{L_2}^2 + \lambda_s^2 |e^{-\varphi_s} u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2) ds \\ &\leq N_1 E |u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + N_2 E \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds + N_2 E \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} e^{-2\varphi_s} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \\ &\leq N_1 E |u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + N_2 E \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{16} E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + N_3 E \left( \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} e^{-\varphi_s} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

with constants  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$  and  $N_3$  depending only on  $d$  and  $\delta$ . Consequently, combining this with (4.18), from (4.17) we get

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 &\leq NE |u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + NE \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds \\ &\quad + NE \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-\varphi_s} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for every stopping time  $\tau \leq T$ . Taking here in place of  $\tau$  the stopping times

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t \in [0, T] : |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \geq n\} \wedge \tau$$

for integers  $n \geq 1$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau_n} |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 &\leq 2NE |u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + 2NE \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2NE \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-\varphi_s} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Letting here  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by Fatou's lemma we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 &\leq 2NE |u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + 2NE \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2NE \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-\varphi_s} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

We use this to estimate the last term in (4.16) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-2\varphi_s} |u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \\
& \leq E \sup_{t \leq T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_t} u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + E \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \right)^2 \\
& \leq NE |u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + NE \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds + NE \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\varphi_s} |\mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus from (4.16) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& E |e^{-\varphi_{T \wedge \tau}} u_{t \wedge \tau}|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} D u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 ds + E \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} \alpha_s |e^{-\varphi_s} u_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 ds \\
& \leq NE |u_0|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + NE \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{F}_s|_{L_2}^2 ds + 2E \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau} |e^{-\varphi_s} \mathfrak{G}_s|_{L_2} ds \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, \delta)$ . Combining this with (4.19) we obtain the estimate (2.15) with any stopping time  $\tau \leq T$  in place of  $T$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.2.* For  $\mathbf{u} = u - v$  we have that for each  $\varphi \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathbb{L}^d$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{u}_t, \varphi \rangle &= - \int_0^t [(a_s^{ij} D_j \mathbf{u}_s + \mathfrak{f}_s^i(u_s) - \mathfrak{f}_s^i(v_s), D_i \varphi) + (u_s(u_s) - v_s(v_s), \varphi)] ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^t (f_s(u_s, D u_s) - f_s(v_s, D v_s), \varphi) ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^t \left( \gamma_s^{ki} (\mathcal{R}(M_s^k(u_s) - M_s^k(v_s)))^i, \varphi \right) ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^t (\sigma_s^{ik} D_i \mathbf{u}_s + h_s^k(u_s) - h_s^k(v_s), \varphi) d w_s^k \tag{4.20}
\end{aligned}$$

holds for  $P \otimes dt$ -a.e.  $(\omega, t) \in [0, T]$ , where  $M_s^k(\cdot)$  is defined in (2.5). As in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we set  $V := \mathcal{V}$ ,  $H := \mathcal{H}$ , use the notation  $V^*$  and  $H^*$  for their conjugate spaces,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  for the duality product between  $V$  and  $V^*$ , and will use Theorem 3.1. In the same fashion as a similar statement in the proof of Theorem 3.1 is established, we can show the existence of a  $V^*$ -valued predictable process  $v^*$  such that

$$\int_0^T |v^*|_{V^*}^2 ds < \infty \text{ (a.s.)},$$

and for all  $\varphi \in V$

$$\langle \varphi, v_s^* \rangle = -(a_s^{ij} D_j \mathbf{u}_s + \mathfrak{f}_s^i(u_s) - \mathfrak{f}_s^i(v_s), D_i \varphi) - (u_s^{Mi} D_i u_s - v_s^{Mi} D_i v_s, \varphi)$$

holds for all  $(\omega, t)$ . Moreover, we can verify that

$$\begin{aligned}
F_s &:= \mathcal{S}(v_s^{Bi} D_i v_s - u_s^{Bi} D_i u_s + f_s(u_s, D u_s) - f_s(v_s, D v_s)) \\
& \quad + \mathcal{S} \left( \gamma_s^{ki} (\mathcal{R}(M_s^k(u_s) - M_s^k(v_s)))^i \right), \quad t \in [0, T]
\end{aligned}$$



and  $G_t = (G_t^k)_{k=1}^\infty$ , defined by

$$G_t^k := \mathcal{S}\left(\sigma^{ik} D_i \mathbf{u}_s + h_s^k(u_s) - h_s^k(v_s)\right)$$

are  $H$ -valued and  $\ell_2(H)$ -valued predictable processes such that

$$\int_0^T \left[ |G_t|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 + |F_s|_H \right] ds < \infty \quad (a.s.).$$

Hence, because  $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathbb{L}_d$  is dense in  $V$ , by virtue of (4.20) we get (3.2) (with  $\mathbf{u}_t$  in place of  $v_t$ ) for all  $v \in V$ . Thus we can use Theorem 3.1 to get that  $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  has an  $H$ -valued continuous  $P \otimes dt$ -modification, denoted also by  $\mathbf{u}$ , such that almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{u}_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 &= -2 \int_0^t \left( a^{ij} D_j \mathbf{u}_s + \mathfrak{f}_s^i(u_s) - \mathfrak{f}_s^i(v_s), D_j \mathbf{u}_s \right) ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t \mathfrak{b}(u_s, u_s, \mathbf{u}_s) - \mathfrak{b}(v_s, v_s, \mathbf{u}_s) ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \left( f(u_s, D u_s) - f(v_s, D v_s), \mathbf{u}_s \right) ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \left( \gamma_s^{ki} (\mathcal{R}(M_s^k(u_s) - M_s^k(v_s)))^i, \mathbf{u}_s \right) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \sum_k \left| \mathcal{S}(\sigma_s^{ik} D_i \mathbf{u}_s + h_s^k(u_s) - h_s^k(v_s)) \right|_H^2 ds + m_t \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , where

$$m_t = 2 \int_0^t \left( \sigma_s^{ik} D_i \mathbf{u}_s + h_s^k(u_s) - h_s^k(v_s), \mathbf{u}_s \right) d w_s^k.$$

By Assumption 2.2 (ii), using Young's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &-2(a_s^{ij} D_j \mathbf{u}_s + \mathfrak{f}_s^i(u_s) - \mathfrak{f}_s^i(v_s), D_j \mathbf{u}_s) \\ &\leq -2(a_s^{ij} D_j \mathbf{u}_s, D_i \mathbf{u}_s) + \frac{\delta}{2} |D \mathbf{u}_s|_{L_2}^2 + N_1 \lambda_s^2 |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

with a constant  $N_1 = N_1(\delta)$ . To estimate the absolute value of

$$I := \mathfrak{b}(v_s, v_s, \mathbf{u}_s) - \mathfrak{b}(u_s, u_s, \mathbf{u}_s)$$

note first that without loss of generality we may assume that  $\hat{u} \leq \hat{v}$ . Using the linearity in the first two arguments of the trilinear functional  $\mathfrak{b}$ , we have the identity

$$I = I_1 + I_2 + I_3,$$

with  $I_1 = -\mathfrak{b}(u_s, u_s, \mathbf{u}_s)$ ,  $I_2 = \mathfrak{b}(u_s, u_s, \mathbf{u}_s)$ ,  $I_3 := -\mathfrak{b}(u_s, u_s, \mathbf{u}_s)$ . Using Corollaries 3.5 and 3.6 we have  $I_1 = I_2 = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} 2|I| = 2|I_3| &\leq N \hat{u} (|D \mathbf{u}_s|_{L_2} + \rho_0^{-1} |\mathbf{u}|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) |D \mathbf{u}_s|_{L_2} + N \bar{u}_s |D \mathbf{u}_s|_{L_2} |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\ &\leq N \hat{u} |D \mathbf{u}_s|_{L_2}^2 + \frac{\delta}{4} |D \mathbf{u}_s|_{L_2}^2 + N_1 (\hat{u}^2 + \bar{u}_s^2) |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

with constants  $N = N(d, r)$  and  $N_1 = N_1(d, r, \delta, \rho_0)$ . By (2.12), using the Cauchy-Schwarz-Bunyakovsky and the Young inequalities we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2(f(u_s, Du_s) - f(v_s, Dv_s), \mathbf{u}_s) &\leq 2(\kappa_s |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \chi_s |Du_s|_{L_2}) |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{8} |Du_s|_{L_2}^2 + N_2(\kappa_s + \chi_s^2) |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

with a constant  $N_2 = N_2(\delta)$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} K_s &:= \left( \gamma_s^{ki} (\mathcal{R}(M_s^k(u_s) - M_s^k(v_s)))^i, \mathbf{u}_s \right) \\ &\leq \vartheta_s \left| \mathcal{R}((M_s(u_s) - M_s(v_s))|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)}) \mathbf{u}_s \right|_{L_1} \\ &\vartheta_s \left| \mathcal{R}((M_s(u_s)) - M_s(v_s))|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right|_{L_2} |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the operator norm of  $\mathcal{R}$  is 1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{R}((M_s(u_s)) - M_s(v_s))|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right|_{L_2}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathcal{R}(M_s^k(u_s) - M_s^k(v_s)) \right|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| M_s^k(u_s) - M_s^k(v_s) \right|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 = \left| M_s(u_s) - M_s(v_s) \right|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \\ &\leq \left| \left| \sigma_s^i D_i \mathbf{u}_s \right|_{\ell_2} + |h_s(u_s) - h_s(v_s)|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right|_{L_2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Remark 2.3 and condition (2.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K_s &\leq \vartheta_s N \left| |Du_s| + \lambda_s |\mathbf{u}_s| \right|_{L_2} |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{16} |Du_s|_{L_2}^2 + N'(\vartheta_s^2 + \lambda_s^2) |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

with constants  $N$  and  $N'$  depending only on  $d$  and  $\delta$ . Since the operator norm of  $\mathcal{S}$  is 1, by Assumption 2.1 and condition (2.11), using the Cauchy-Schwarz-Bunyakovsky and the Young inequalities we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_k \left| \mathcal{S}(\sigma_s^{ik} D_i \mathbf{u}_s + h_s^k(u_s) - h_s^k(v_s)) \right|_H^2 \\ &\leq \sum_k \left| \sigma_s^{ik} D_i \mathbf{u}_s + h_s^k(u_s) - h_s^k(v_s) \right|_H^2 \\ &\leq (\sigma_s^{ik} \sigma_s^{jk} D_i \mathbf{u}_s, D_j \mathbf{u}_s) + \frac{\delta}{32} |Du_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + N \lambda_s^2 |\mathbf{u}_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, \delta)$ . Consequently, by virtue of the estimates (4.22) through (4.26) and taking into account that

$$-((2a^{ij} - \sigma^{ik} \sigma^{jk}) D_j \mathbf{u}_s, D_i \mathbf{u}_s) \leq -2\delta |Du_s|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2,$$

from (4.21) we get

$$d|\mathbf{u}_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \leq -(\delta - N\hat{u}) |Du_t|^2 dt + \zeta_t |\mathbf{u}_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} dt + dm_t,$$

where  $N = N(d, r)$  is a constant, and

$$\zeta_t = N'(\hat{u} + \hat{u}_t^2 + \lambda_t^2 + \chi^2 + \vartheta_t^2 + \kappa_t)$$

with a constant  $N' = N'(d, r, \delta, \rho_0)$ . Set

$$\phi_t := \int_0^t \zeta_s ds, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Then for  $\hat{u} \leq \delta/N$  we have

$$e^{-\phi_t} |\mathbf{u}_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \leq \int_0^t e^{-\phi_s} dm_s =: m'_t, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Here  $m' = (m'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a nonnegative local martingale starting from 0. Then almost surely  $m'_t = 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , which finishes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## 5. ON $W_2^1$ -REGULARITY OF ADMISSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Let  $u$  be an  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution to (2.1)-(2.2) in  $[0, T]$ , and consider the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} dv_t = & (D_i(a_t^{ij} D_j v_t + \mathfrak{f}_t^i(u_t)) + f_t(u_t, Du_t) - v_{t(u_t)} - \nabla p_t + \gamma_t^{ki} D_i q_t^k) dt \\ & + (\sigma_t^{ik} D_i v_t + h_t^k(u_t) - \nabla q_t^k) dw_t^k, \quad \operatorname{div} v_t = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , with initial condition

$$v_0(x) = u_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (5.2)$$

for  $v = (v_t^1(t, x), \dots, v_t^d(t, x))$ , where

$$\nabla q_t^k = \mathcal{R}(\sigma_t^{jk} D_j v_t + h_t^k(u_t)) \quad P \otimes dt \otimes dx\text{-a.e.} \quad \text{for every } k \geq 1. \quad (5.3)$$

Like the  $\mathcal{H}$  solution  $u$  to (2.1)-(2.2) is defined, we say that  $v$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution to (5.1)-(5.2) if it is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued continuous  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process,

$$\int_0^T |v_t|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 < \infty \quad (a.s.),$$

and almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} (v_t, \psi) = & (u_0, \psi) - \int_0^t [(a_s^{ij} D_j v_s + \mathfrak{f}_s^i(u_s), D_i \psi) + (v_{s(u_s)}, \psi)] ds \\ & + \int_0^t [(\gamma_s^{ki} \mathcal{R}(\sigma_s^{jk} D_j v_s + h_s^k(u_s)))^i + f_s(u_s, Du_s), \psi)] ds \\ & + \int_0^t (\sigma_s^{jk} D_j v_s + h_s^k(u_s), \psi) dw_s^k, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\psi \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Clearly,  $u$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution to (5.1)-(5.2). We are going to use this to raise the regularity of  $u$ . To this end we make the following additional assumption.

**Assumption 5.1.** There exist constants  $K_i$  ( $i=1,2,3$ ), a nonnegative predictable process  $\theta = \theta_t$  and a nonnegative  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable function  $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_t(x)$  on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , such that

$$\int_0^T \theta_t^2 dt < \infty, \quad \int_0^T |\mathfrak{H}_t|_{L_2}^2 dt < \infty \quad (a.s.),$$

and for all  $(\omega, t)$  we have

(i)  $a_t^{ij}$  and  $\sigma^i$  (as an  $\ell_2$ -valued function) are continuously differentiable in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for each  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, d$  such that

$$\sum_{ij} |Da_t^{ij}|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 + \sum_i |D\sigma^i|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \leq \theta_t^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_k \sum_i |\gamma_t^{ki}|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 \leq K_1,$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ;

(ii) the  $\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued function  $h_t = h_t(x, u)$  is continuously differentiable in  $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , and the partial derivatives  $\partial_x h_t$  and  $\partial_u h_t$  take values in  $\ell_2 := \ell_2(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$  such that for all  $(x, u)$ ;

$$|\partial_x h_t(x, u)|_{\ell_2} \leq \theta_t u + \mathfrak{H}_t(x), \quad |\partial_u h_t(x, u)|_{\ell_2} \leq K_2;$$

(iii) for all  $(x, u, z) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

$$|f_t(x, u, z)|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \leq \theta_t |u|_{\mathbb{R}^d} + K_3 |z|_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}} + \mathfrak{H}_t(x).$$

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 5.1 hold with  $\mathfrak{f} = 0$ . Let  $u$  be an admissible solution to (2.1)-(2.2) such that  $u_0 \in \mathcal{V}$  (a.s.). Then there is a constant  $N = N(r, d) > 0$  such that if  $\hat{u} \leq \delta/N$  then  $u = (u_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a continuous  $\mathcal{V}$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process such that  $u \in L_2([0, T], \mathbb{W}_2^2)$  (a.s.).*

To prove this theorem first we prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 (i) and 2.3 hold. Let  $u$  be an admissible  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued function, such that*

$$u \in L_\infty([0, T], \mathbb{L}_2) \cap L_2([0, T], \mathbb{W}_2^1) \quad (a.s.). \quad (5.5)$$

*Then there is a constant  $N = N(d, r) > 0$  such that if  $\hat{u} \leq \delta/N$  then (5.1)-(5.2) has a unique  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution  $v = (v_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ .*

*Proof.* We are going to cast the above system of equations into a stochastic evolution equation of the type considered in [26]. For this reason set  $V := \mathcal{V}$ ,  $H := \mathcal{H}$ , and for every  $(\omega, t)$  define the linear operators  $A_t : V \rightarrow V^*$  and  $B_t = (B_t^k)_{k=1}^\infty : V \rightarrow \ell_2(H)$  by requiring

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi, A_t v \rangle &= -(\varphi, u_t^{Mi} D_i v + N_0 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 v + \delta v) - (D_i \varphi, a_t^{ij} D_j v) \\ (\varphi, B_t^k v)_H &= (\varphi, \sigma_t^{ik} D_i v), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$  are the scalar products in  $\mathbb{L}_2$  and in  $H$ , respectively, and  $N_0 = N_0(d, r)$  is a constant, specified later. By Lemma 3.2

$$(\varphi, u_t^{Mi} D_i v) \leq |u_t^{Mi} \varphi|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |D_i v|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \leq N \hat{u} (|D\varphi|_{L_2} + \rho_0^{-1} |\varphi|_{\mathbb{L}_2}) |v|_H$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, r)$ , and

$$(D_i \varphi, a_t^{ij} D_j v) \leq N |D\varphi|_{L_2} |Dv|_{L_2},$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(\varphi, \sigma_t^{ik} D_i v)|^2 \leq N^2 |\varphi|_H^2 |Dv|_{L_2}^2$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, \delta)$ . Thus  $A_t$  and  $B_t$  are bounded linear operators mapping  $V$  into  $V^*$  and  $\ell_2(H)$ , respectively, and their operator norms are bounded by  $N(d, r, \rho_0, \delta, \hat{u})$  and  $N(d, \delta)$ , respectively. Moreover, for  $v \in V$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, A_t v \rangle &\leq -(D_i v, a_t^{ij} D_j v) - (N_0 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 + \delta) |v|_H^2 \\ &\quad + (\delta/2) |Dv|_{L_2}^2 + N_1 \hat{u} |Dv|_{L_2}^2 + N_2 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 |v|_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

with constants  $N_1 = N_1(d, r)$  and  $N_2 = N_2(d, r, \delta)$ . From (5.6)

$$|B_t v|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 \leq \|\sigma_t^i D_i v\|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.$$

Combining this with (5.7) we get

$$2\langle v, A_t v \rangle + |B_t v|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 \leq -((2a^{ij} - \sigma^{ik} \sigma^{jk}) D_j v, D_i v)$$

$$-2(N_0 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 + \delta) |v|_H^2 + \delta |Dv|_{L_2}^2 + 2N_1 \hat{u} |Dv|_{L_2}^2 + 2N_2 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 |v|_H^2$$

for  $v \in V$ . Hence using Assumption 2.1 (i) and taking  $N_0 := N_2$ , for  $\hat{u} \leq \delta/(2N_1)$  we have

$$2\langle v, A_t v \rangle + |B_t v|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 \leq -\delta |v|_V^2 \quad \text{for } v \in V. \quad (5.8)$$

Define for each  $(\omega, t)$  the linear operators  $A_t : V \rightarrow H$  and  $C_t : H \rightarrow H$  such that for all  $\varphi \in V$  and  $v \in H$

$$(\varphi, A_t v)_H = (\varphi, -u_t^{Bi} D_i v + \gamma^{ki} (\mathcal{R}(\sigma_t^{jk} D_j v))^i)$$

$$(\varphi, C_t v)_H = (\varphi, N_0 \rho_0^{-2} v + \delta v).$$

Using the admissibility of  $u$ , condition (2.8) and that the operator norm of  $\mathcal{R} : \mathbb{L}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_2$  is 1, we get

$$(\varphi, -u_t^{Bi} D_i v + \gamma^{ki} (\mathcal{R}(\sigma_t^{jk} D_j v))^i) \leq N(\bar{u}_t + \vartheta_t) |\varphi|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |Dv|_{L_2},$$

and clearly,

$$(\varphi, N_0 \rho_0^{-2} v + \delta v) \leq (N_0 \rho_0^{-2} v + \delta) |\varphi|_{\mathbb{L}_2} |v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}.$$

Hence  $A_t : V \rightarrow H$  and  $C_t : H \rightarrow H$  are bounded operators, and for their operator norms,  $|A_t|_A$  and  $|C_t|_C$  we have

$$\int_0^T (|A_t|_A^2 + |C_t|_C) dt < \infty \quad (a.s.). \quad (5.9)$$

Finally for each  $(\omega, t)$  we define  $F_t^* \in V^*$ ,  $F_t \in H$  and  $G_t = (G_t^k) \in \ell_2(H)$  such that

$$\langle \varphi, F_t^* \rangle = (D_i \varphi, f_t^i(u_t)), \quad (\varphi, F_t)_H = (\varphi, f_t(u_t, Du_t)),$$

$$(\varphi, G_t^k)_H = (\varphi, h_t^k(u_t)), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

for  $\varphi \in V$ . By Assumption 2.2 (i),

$$(D_i \varphi, \mathfrak{f}_t^i(u_t)) \leq N |\varphi|_V (\lambda_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + |\mathfrak{F}_t|_{L_2}),$$

$$(\varphi, f_t(u_t, Du_t)) \leq N |\varphi|_H (\kappa_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \chi_t |Du_t|_{L_2} + |\mathfrak{G}_t|_{L_2}),$$

with a constant  $N = N(d)$ , and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(\varphi, h_t^k(u_t))|^2 \leq N |\varphi|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 (\lambda_t^2 |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + |\mathfrak{F}_t|_{L_2}^2).$$

Hence, due to (2.9) and (5.5) it is easy to check that

$$\int_0^T (|F_t^*|_{V^*}^2 + |G_t|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 + |F_t|_H) dt < \infty \quad (a.s.). \quad (5.10)$$

Consider now the stochastic evolution equation

$$dv_t = (A_t v_t + \mathbb{A}_t v_t + C_t v_t + F_t^* + F_t) dt + (B_t^k v_t + G_t^k) dw_t^k, \quad t \in (0, T] \quad (5.11)$$

$$v_t|_{t=0} = u_0. \quad (5.12)$$

Then we can see that  $v = (v_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution to (5.1)-(5.2) if and only if it is an  $H$ -solution to (5.11)-(5.12). Due to (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10) we can apply Theorem 5.1 in [26] to get that there is a unique  $H$ -solution to (5.1)-(5.2), which finishes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorems 5.1.* Now we set  $H = \mathcal{V}$ , and let  $V$  be the subspace of divergence free functions of  $\mathbb{W}_2^2$ . If  $h \in \mathcal{V}$  then  $h^{(\varepsilon)}$ , the convolution of  $h$  with  $k_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-d} k(\cdot/\varepsilon)$  for a smooth function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with compact support and of unit integral, belongs to  $V$  for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $h^{(\varepsilon)} \rightarrow h$  in  $H$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . This shows that  $V$  is a dense subset of  $H$ . It is also separable, as a closed subspace of the separable Hilbert space  $\mathbb{W}_2^2$ . Define for each  $(\omega, t)$  the linear operators

$$A_t : V \rightarrow V^* \quad \text{and} \quad B_t : V \rightarrow \ell_2(H)$$

by requiring

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi, A_t v \rangle &= -((1 - \Delta)\varphi, u_t^{M_i} D_i v) - ((1 - \Delta)\varphi, N_0(\rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 + 1)v) \\ &\quad - ((1 - \Delta)\varphi, \delta v) - (D_i \varphi, a_t^{ij} D_j v) - (D_k D_i \varphi, a_t^{ij} D_k D_j v), \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

and

$$(\varphi, B_t^k v)_H = (\varphi, \sigma_t^{ik} D_i v) + (D_l \varphi, \sigma_t^{ik} D_l D_i v) \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (5.14)$$

to hold for any  $\varphi, v \in V$ , where  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$  are the scalar products in  $\mathbb{L}_2$  and in  $H$ , respectively, and  $N_0 = N_0(d, r)$  is a constant, specified later.

Note that by Lemma 3.2

$$((\Delta - 1)\varphi, u_t^{M_i} D_i v) \leq |\varphi|_V |u_t^{M_i} D_i v|_{\mathbb{L}_2} \leq N \hat{u} |\varphi|_V (|D^2 v|_{L_2} + \rho_0^{-1} |Dv|_{L_2}),$$

with  $N = N(d, r)$ , and clearly,

$$-(D_i \varphi, a_t^{ij} D_j v) - (D_k D_i \varphi, a_t^{ij} D_k D_j v) \leq N |\varphi|_V |v|_V$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, \delta)$ . Hence it is easy to see that  $A_t$  is a bounded linear operator from  $V$  into  $V^*$  with operator norm bounded by a constant  $N$  depending only on  $d, r, \delta, \rho_0$  and  $\hat{u}$ . Moreover, for  $v \in V$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, A_t v \rangle &\leq -(D_i v, a_t^{ij} D_j v) - (D_k D_i v, a_t^{ij} D_k D_j v) - (N_0 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u} + N_0) |v|_H^2 \\ &\quad - \delta |v|_H^2 + (\delta/8) |v|_V^2 + N_1 \hat{u} |v|_V^2 + N_2 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 |v|_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

with constants  $N_1 = N_1(d, r)$  and  $N_2 = N_2(d, r, \delta)$ . Note also that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(\varphi, \sigma_t^{ik} D_i v) + (D_l \varphi, \sigma_t^{ik} D_l D_i v)|^2 \\ &\leq 2|\varphi|_H^2 \left( \sum_k |\sigma_t^{ik} D_i v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + \sum_k |\sigma_t^{ik} D_l D_i v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \right) \\ &\leq N |v|_H^2 (|Dv|_{L_2}^2 + |D^2 v|_{L_2}^2) \leq N |v|_H^2 |v|_V^2 \end{aligned}$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, \delta)$ , which shows that  $B_t = (B_t^k)$  is bounded linear map from  $V$  into  $\ell_2(H)$ , with operator norm bounded by  $N$ . From (5.14) we get

$$|B_t v|_H^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\sigma_t^{ik} D_i v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^d |\sigma_t^{ik} D_j D_i v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + \frac{\delta}{2} |D^2 v|_{L_2}^2 + N_3 |Dv|_{L_2}^2$$

with a constant  $N_3 = N_3(d, \delta)$ . Combining this with (5.15) and using that due to Assumption 2.1

$$\begin{aligned} &-2(D_i v, a_t^{ij} D_j v) - 2(D_k D_i v, a_t^{ij} D_k D_j v) \\ &+ \sum_k |\sigma_t^{ik} D_i v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + \sum_k \sum_j |\sigma_t^{ik} D_j D_i v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \leq -2\delta (|Dv|_{L_2}^2 + |D^2 v|_{L_2}^2), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle v, A_t v \rangle + |B_t v|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 &\leq -\delta (|Dv|_{L_2}^2 + |D^2 v|_{L_2}^2) \\ &+ 2N_2 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 |v|_H^2 + 2N_1 \hat{u} |v|_V^2 + N_3 |v|_H^2 - 2N_0 (\rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 + 1) |v|_H^2 - 2\delta |v|_H^2 \end{aligned}$$

Hence for  $N_0 = N_3 + N_2$  and  $N_1 \hat{u} \leq \delta/2$  we get

$$2\langle v, A_t v \rangle + |B_t v|_{\ell_2(H)}^2 \leq -(\delta/2) |v|_V^2 \quad (5.16)$$

for  $v \in V$ .

Next, we define the linear operators  $A_t^* : H \rightarrow V^*$ ,  $C_t : H \rightarrow H$  and  $B_t : H \rightarrow \ell_2(H)$  by requiring that for all  $\varphi \in V$  and  $v \in H$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi, A_t^* v \rangle &= -((1 - \Delta)\varphi, u_t^{Bi} D_i v)_{\mathbb{L}_2} - (D_k D_i \varphi, D_k a_t^{ij} D_j v)_{\mathbb{L}_2} \\ &\quad + ((1 - \Delta)\varphi, \gamma^{ki} (\mathcal{R}\sigma^{jk} D_j v)^i), \\ (\varphi, B_t^k v)_H &= (D_l \varphi, D_l \sigma_t^{ik} D_i v)_{\mathbb{L}_2}, \\ (\varphi, C_t v)_H &= ((1 - \Delta)\varphi, N_0 (\rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 + 1)v + \delta v)_{\mathbb{L}_2} \end{aligned}$$

hold. Due to Assumption 5.1 and that  $u$  is admissible, we have

$$((1 - \Delta)\varphi, u_t^{Bi} D_i v) + (D_k D_i \varphi, D_k a_t^{ij} D_j v)_{\mathbb{L}_2} \leq N(\bar{u}_t + \theta_t) |\varphi|_V |v|_H,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( (1 - \Delta)\varphi, \gamma^{ki}(\mathcal{R}(\sigma_t^{jk} D_j v))^i \right) &\leq K_1 |\varphi|_V \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\mathcal{R}(\sigma_t^{jk} D_j v)|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq K_1 |\varphi|_V \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\sigma_t^{jk} D_j v|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq N K_1 |\varphi|_V |v|_H, \\
\sum_k |(D_l \varphi, D_l \sigma_t^{ik} D_i v)_{\mathbb{L}_2}|^2 &\leq N \theta_t^2 |\varphi|_V^2 |v|_H^2
\end{aligned}$$

with a constant  $N = N(d, \delta)$  and with the constant  $K_1$  and process  $\theta$  from Assumption 5.1. Clearly,

$$|C_t v|_H \leq (N_0 \rho_0^{-2} \hat{u}^2 + N_0 + \delta) |v|_H.$$

Consequently,  $A_t$ ,  $A_t^*$ ,  $B_t$  and  $C_t$  are bounded linear operators for every  $(\omega, t)$ , and their operator norms,  $|A_t^*|$ ,  $|B_t|$  and  $|C_t|$ , satisfy

$$\int_0^T [ |A_t^*|^2 + |B_t|^2 + |C_t| ] dt < \infty \quad (a.s.). \quad (5.17)$$

For each  $(\omega, t)$  we define  $F_t^* \in V^*$ ,  $G_t = (G_t^k) \in \ell_2(H)$  by requiring that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \varphi, F_t^* \rangle &= ((1 - \Delta)\varphi, f_t(u_t, Du_t) + \gamma_t^{ki}(\mathcal{R}h_t^k(u_t))^i), \\
(u, G_t^k)_H &= ((1 - \Delta)\varphi, h_t^k(u_t))
\end{aligned}$$

hold for all  $\varphi \in V$ . By Assumption 5.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
((1 - \Delta)\varphi, f_t(u_t, Du_t)) &\leq |\varphi|_V (\theta_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + K_3 |Du_t|_{L_2} + |\mathfrak{H}_t|_{L_2}), \\
((1 - \Delta)\varphi, \gamma_t^{ki}(\mathcal{R}h_t^k(u_t))^i) &\leq |\varphi|_V K_1 \|h_t(u_t)\|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R})} |L_2| \\
&\leq K_1 |\varphi|_V (\lambda_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + |\mathfrak{F}_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}), \\
&\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |((1 - \Delta)\varphi, h_t^k(u_t))|^2 \\
&\leq 2|\varphi|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 \|h_t(u_t)\|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 |L_2|^2 + 2\|D\varphi\|_{L_2}^2 \|D(h_t(u_t))\|_{\ell_2(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})}^2 |L_2|^2 \\
&\leq N |\varphi|_H^2 ((\lambda_t^2 + \theta_t^2) |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + K_2^2 |Du_t|_{L_2}^2 + \mathfrak{F}_t^2 + \mathfrak{H}_t^2),
\end{aligned}$$

which show that

$$\int_0^T (|F_t^*|_{V^*}^2 + |G_t|_{\ell_2}^2) dt < \infty \quad (a.s.). \quad (5.18)$$

Let us now consider the evolution equation

$$dv_t = (A_t v_t + A_t^* v_t + C_t v_t + F_t^*) dt + (B_t^k v_t + B_t^k v_t + G_t^k) dw_t^k, \quad (5.19)$$

$$v_t|_{t=0} = u_0. \quad (5.20)$$

Then due to (5.16), (5.17) and (5.18) we can apply Theorem 5.1 in [26] to get that (5.19)-(5.20) has a unique  $H$ -solution  $v = (v_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ . Hence it follows that almost surely (5.4) holds for  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\psi = (1 - \Delta)\varphi$  for all divergence-free vector fields  $\varphi \in \mathbb{W}_2^3$ , which implies that  $v$  is the unique  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution of (5.1)-(5.2). By Proposition 5.2 there is a constant  $N = N(d, r) > 0$  such that if  $\hat{u} \leq \delta/N$  then  $u$  is the unique  $\mathcal{H}$ -solution to



(5.1)-(5.2). Consequently, there is a (finite) constant  $N = N(d, r) > 0$  such that if  $\hat{u} \leq \delta/N$ , then almost surely  $u_t = v_t$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , that finishes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

*Remark 5.1.* We note that if in Definition 2.1 of a solution  $u$  to (2.1)-(2.2) we require  $u \in L_2([0, T], \mathcal{V})$  (a.s.) instead of  $u \in L_2([0, T], \mathcal{V}) \cap L_\infty([0, T], \mathcal{H})$  (a.s.), then Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and 5.1 remain valid, provided in Assumption 2.2 we assume that  $\lambda$  is a nonnegative constant and  $\kappa$  is a nonnegative predictable process such that

$$\int_0^T \kappa_t^2 dt < \infty \text{ (a.s.)},$$

instead of assuming that  $\lambda$  and  $\kappa$  are nonnegative predictable processes such that

$$\int_0^T \lambda_t^2 + \kappa_t dt < \infty \text{ (a.s.)}.$$

*Proof.* Notice that in the proof of Theorem 2.1 we only use  $u \in L_\infty([0, T], \mathcal{H})$  (a.s.) when we prove that

$$I := \int_0^T \lambda_t^2 |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 + \kappa_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} + \vartheta_t \lambda_t |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2} dt < \infty \text{ (a.s.)},$$

see (4.5), (4.7) and (4.8). Clearly, if  $\lambda$  is a nonnegative constant and  $\kappa \in L_2([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  (a.s.) then

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \lambda^2 \int_0^T |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 dt + \left( \int_0^T \kappa_t^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_0^T |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \lambda \left( \int_0^T \vartheta_t^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_0^T |u_t|_{\mathbb{L}_2}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} < \infty \text{ (a.s.)}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the remark.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Agresti and M. Veraar, Stochastic Navier–Stokes equations for turbulent flows in critical spaces,
- [2] S. Albeverio and A.B. Cruzeiro, Global flow and invariant (Gibbs) measure for Euler and Navier-Stokes two dimensional fluids, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 129 (1990), 431-444.
- [3] S. Albeverio and B. Ferrario, Uniqueness results for the generators of the two-dimensional Euler and Navier-Stokes flows. The case of Gaussian invariant measures, *J. Funct. Anal.* 193 (2002), no. 1, 77-93.
- [4] S. Albeverio and B. Ferrario, Uniqueness of solutions of the stochastic Navier-Stokes equation with invariant measure given by the enstrophy, *Ann. Probab.* 32 (2004), no. 2, 1632-1649.
- [5] V. Barbu and M. Röckner, Global solutions to random 3D vorticity equations for small initial data, *J. Differential Equations* 263 (2017) 5395-5411.
- [6] A. Bensoussan, Stochastic Navier-Stokes equations, *Acta Appl. Math.* 38 (1995), 267-304.
- [7] A. Bensoussan and R. Temam, Equations Stochastiques du Type Navier-Stokes, *Journal of Functional Analysis* 13 (1973), 195-222.

- [8] L. A. Bianchi and F. Flandoli, Stochastic Navier-Stokes Equations and Related Models, *Milan J. Math.* Vol. 88 (2020) 225-246.
- [9] J. Bricmont, Ergodicity and mixing for stochastic partial differential equations, in Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Beijing, 2002), Vol. 1 (Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002), pp. 567–585.
- [10] Z. Brzeźniak, M. Capiński and F. Flandoli, Stochastic Navier–Stokes equations with multiplicative noise. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* 10 (1992), 523–532.
- [11] M. Capinski, N. Cutland, Stochastic Navier–Stokes equations, *Acta Appl. Math.* 25 (1991), 59-85.
- [12] M. Capinski, D. Gatarek, Stochastic equations in Hilbert space with application to Navier-Stokes equations in any dimension, *J. Funct. Anal.* 126 (1994), no. 1, 26-35.
- [13] M. Capinski, S. Peszat, On the existence of a solution to stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Nonlinear Anal.* 44 (2001), no. 2, Ser. A: Theory Methods, 141-177.
- [14] G. Da Prato, A. Debussche, Two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations driven by a space-time white noise. *J. Funct. Anal.* 196 (2002), no. 1, 180–210.
- [15] G. Da Prato, A. Debussche, Dynamic programming for the stochastic Navier-Stokes equations, *M2AN Math. Model Numer. Anal.* 34 (2000), n.2, 459-475.
- [16] G. Da Prato, A. Debussche, Ergodicity for the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 82 (2003), 877-947.
- [17] H. Dong and D. Dapeng, The Navier-Stokes Equations in the Critical Lebesgue Space, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 292 (2009), 811–827
- [18] W. E and J.C. Mattingly, Ergodicity for the Navier-Stokes equation with degenerate random forcing: finite-dimensional approximation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, vol. 54 no. 11 (2001), pp. 1386–1402.
- [19] W. E, J.C. Mattingly and Ya. Sinai, Gibbsian dynamics and ergodicity for the stochastically forced Navier-Stokes equation, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 224 (2001), no. 1, 83–106.
- [20] L. Escauriaza, G. Seregin and V. Šverák,  $L_{3,\infty}$ -solutions of Navier-Stokes equations and backward uniqueness (In Russian). *Usp. Mat. Nauk* 58(2)(350), 3–44 (2003); translation in *Russ. Math. Surv.* 58(2), 211–250 (2003).
- [21] R. Farwiq, From Jean Leray to the millennium problem: the Navier–Stokes equations, *J. Evol. Equ.* 21 (2021), 3243–3263.
- [22] F. Flandoli, An Introduction to 3D Stochastic Fluid Dynamics, 51-150, in *Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1942*, Springer Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2008.
- [23] F. Flandoli and B. Maslowski, Ergodicity of the 2-D Navier-Stokes Equation Under Random Perturbations *Commun. Math. Phys.* 171, 119-141 (1995).
- [24] B. Ferrario, Uniqueness result for the 2D Navier-Stokes equation with additive noise, *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.* 75 (2003), no. 6, 435-442.
- [25] H. Fujita Yashima, *Equations de Navier-Stokes Stochastiques non Homogènes et Applications*. Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 1992.
- [26] I. Gyöngy and N. V. Krylov, Once again on evolution equations with monotone operators in Hilbert spaces and applications,
- [27] E. Hopf, Über die Anfangswertaufgabe über die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen, *Math. Nachr.*, 4 (1951) 213-231.
- [28] N.V. Krylov, Estimates in  $L_p$  for solutions to SPDEs with coefficients in Morrey classes, *Stoch. PDE: Anal. Comp.*, 2022.
- [29] N.V. Krylov, On strong solutions of Itô's equations with  $D\sigma$  and  $b$  in Morrey classes containing  $L_d$ , *Ann. Probab.* 51 (5) (2023) 1729–1751.
- [30] I. Kukavica, F. Wang and F. Xu, Local existence of the stochastic Navier-Stokes equations in the whole space, *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40072-024-00341-0>.
- [31] N.V. Krylov, On parabolic equations in Sobolev spaces with lower order coefficients from Morrey spaces, arXiv:2311.03238.

- [32] S.B. Kuksin and O. Penrose, A family of balance relations for the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations with random forcing. *J. Stat. Phys.* 118 (2005), no. 3-4, 437–449.
- [33] S.B. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan Stochastic dissipative PDEs and Gibbs measures, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 213 (2000), no. 2, 291–330.
- [34] S.B. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan, Ergodicity for the randomly forced 2D Navier-Stokes equations, *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.* 4 (2001), no. 2, 147–195.
- [35] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya, The mathematical theory of viscous incompressible flow, New York, NY: Gordon & Breach 1963.
- [36] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, V.A. Solonnikov, N.N. Ural'tseva, Linear and quasi-linear parabolic equations, Nauka, Moscow, 1967 in Russian. English translation: American Math. Soc., Providence, 1968.
- [37] J. Leray, Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace, *Acta Math.* 63 (1934), no. 1, 193–248.
- [38] J.L. Lions, Quelques méthodes de résolution de problèmes aux limites non linéaires, Dunod Gauthier-Villars, Paris 1969.
- [39] J.C. Mattingly and M. Hairer, Ergodicity of the 2D Navier–Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 164 (2006), no. 3, 993–1032.
- [40] J.L. Menaldi, S.S. Sritharan, Stochastic 2-D Navier–Stokes equation, *Appl. Math. Optimiz.* 46 (2002), 31–53.
- [41] R. Mikulevicius and B. L. Rozovskii, Stochastic Navier-Stokes Equations. In *Stochastics in Finite and Infinite Dimensions: in Honor of Gopiah Kallianpur* (T. Hida et al., eds.) 285-302, Kirkhauser, Boston.
- [42] R. Mikulevicius and B. L. Rozovskii, Stochastic Navier-Stokes Equations for turbulent flows, *Siam J. Math. Anal.*, Vol. 35 (2004), No. 5, pp. 1250-1310.
- [43] R. Mikulevicius, On strong  $H_2^1$ -solutions of Stochastic Navier-Stokes Equations in a bounded domain, *Siam J. Math. Anal.*, Vol. 41 (2009), No. 3, pp. 1206 -1230.
- [44] R. Mikulevicius and B. L. Rozovskii, Global  $L_2$ -Solutions of stochastic Navier-Stokes Equations, *The Annals of Probability*, Vol. 33 (2005), No. 1, 137–176.
- [45] M. T. Mohan and S. S. Sritharan,  $L_p$ -solutions of the stochastic Navier-Stokes equations subject to Lévy noise with  $\mathbb{L}_m(\mathbb{R}^m)$  initial data, *Evol. Equ. Control Theory* 6 (2017), no. 3, 409–425.
- [46] O. Ladyzhenskaya, On the uniqueness and smoothness of generalised solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)* 5 (1967), 169-185; English transl.: *Sem. Math. V. A. Steklov Math. Inst. Leningrad* 5, 60–66.
- [47] G. Prodi, Un teorema di unicità per le equazioni di Navier-Stokes, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* 48 (1959), 173–182.
- [48] J.C. Robinson, The Navier-Stokes regularity problem. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* 378: 20190526, 2022.
- [49] J. Serrin, On the interior regularity of weak solutions of Navier-Stokes equations, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* 9 (1962), 187–195.
- [50] R. Temam, Navier-Stokes equations, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977.
- [51] W. von Wahl, The Equations of Navier-Stokes and Abstract Parabolic Equations, Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH, 1985.
- [52] J. Zhu, Z. Brzeźniak and W. Liu,  $L_p$ -solutions for stochastic Navier–Stokes equations with jump noise, *Statistics and Probability Letters* 155 (2019), 108563

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND MAXWELL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH,  
KING'S BUILDINGS, EDINBURGH, EH9 3JZ, UNITED KINGDOM

*Email address:* `gyongy@maths.ed.ac.uk`

127 VINCENT HALL, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MN, 55455, USA

*Email address:* `krylov@math.umn.edu`